

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

BOISEY CALDWELL,

Plaintiff,

-against-

NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF LAW,
OFFICER GERONIMO GERMAN,

Defendants.

19-CV-8835 (CM)

ORDER

COLLEEN McMAHON, United States District Judge:

Plaintiff filed this action *pro se*. On November 22, 2019, the Court dismissed the complaint for failure to state a claim. (ECF No. 6.)¹ Plaintiff filed a notice of appeal on December 9, 2019, and a motion for summary judgment on January 10, 2020. On May 15, 2020, the Second Circuit dismissed the appeal because it “lack[ed] an arguable basis either in law or in fact.” *See Caldwell v. N.Y.C. Dep’t of Law*, No. 19-4073 (2d Cir. May 15, 2020).

The Court liberally construes the motion for summary judgment as a motion under Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) to alter or amend judgment and a motion under Local Civil Rule 6.3 for reconsideration, and, in the alternative, as a motion under Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) for relief from a judgment or order. *See Triestman v. Fed. Bureau of Prisons*, 470 F.3d 471, 474 (2d Cir. 2006); *see also Tracy v. Freshwater*, 623 F.3d 90, 101 (2d Cir. 2010) (The solicitude afforded to *pro se* litigants takes a variety of forms, including liberal construction of papers, “relaxation of the limitations on the amendment of pleadings,” leniency in the enforcement of other procedural rules, and “deliberate, continuing efforts to ensure that a *pro se* litigant understands what is

¹ The Court dismissed Plaintiff’s claims against Officer German without prejudice to his pending claims against the same officer in *Caldwell v. N.Y.C. Dep’t of Law*, ECF 1:19-CV-8253, 2 (KPF) (pending).

required of him”) (citations omitted). After reviewing the arguments in Plaintiff’s submission, the Court denies the motion.

DISCUSSION

The standards governing Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) and Local Civil Rule 6.3 are the same. *R.F.M.A.S., Inc. v. Mimi So*, 640 F. Supp. 2d 506, 509 (S.D.N.Y. 2009). The movant must demonstrate that the Court overlooked “controlling law or factual matters” that had been previously put before it. *Id.* at 509 (discussion in the context of both Local Civil Rule 6.3 and Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e)); *see Padilla v. Maersk Line, Ltd.*, 636 F. Supp. 2d 256, 258-59 (S.D.N.Y. 2009). “Such motions must be narrowly construed and strictly applied in order to discourage litigants from making repetitive arguments on issues that have been thoroughly considered by the court.” *Range Road Music, Inc. v. Music Sales Corp.*, 90 F. Supp. 2d 390, 391-92 (S.D.N.Y. 2000); *see also SimplexGrinnell LP v. Integrated Sys. & Power, Inc.*, 642 F. Supp. 2d 206 (S.D.N.Y. 2009) (“A motion for reconsideration is not an invitation to parties to ‘treat the court’s initial decision as the opening of a dialogue in which that party may then use such a motion to advance new theories or adduce new evidence in response to the court’s ruling.’”) (internal quotation and citations omitted).

Plaintiff has failed to demonstrate in his motion that the Court overlooked any controlling decisions or factual matters with respect to the dismissed action. Plaintiff’s motion under Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) and Local Civil Rule 6.3 is therefore denied.

Under Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b), a party may seek relief from a district court’s order or judgment for the following reasons:

(1) mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect; (2) newly discovered evidence that, with reasonable diligence, could not have been discovered in time to move for a new trial under Rule 59(b); (3) fraud (whether previously called intrinsic or extrinsic), misrepresentation, or other misconduct of an opposing party; (4) the judgment is void; (5) the judgment has been satisfied, released, or

discharged; it is based on an earlier judgment that has been reversed or vacated; or applying it prospectively is no longer equitable; or (6) any other reason justifying relief.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b).

The Court has considered Plaintiff's arguments, and even under a liberal interpretation of his motion, Plaintiff has failed to allege facts demonstrating that any of the grounds listed in the first five clauses of Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) apply. Therefore, the motion under any of these clauses is denied.

To the extent that Plaintiff seeks relief under Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(6), the motion is also denied. "[A] Rule 60(b)(6) motion must be based upon some reason other than those stated in clauses (1)-(5)." *United Airlines, Inc. v. Brien*, 588 F.3d 158, 175 (2d Cir. 2009) (quoting *Smith v. Sec'y of HHS*, 776 F.2d 1330, 1333 (6th Cir. 1985)). A party moving under Rule 60(b)(6) cannot circumvent the one-year limitation applicable to claims under clauses (1)-(3) by invoking the residual clause (6) of Rule 60(b). *Id.* A Rule 60(b)(6) motion must show both that the motion was filed within a "reasonable time" and that "'extraordinary circumstances' [exist] to warrant relief." *Old Republic Ins. Co. v. Pac. Fin. Servs. of America, Inc.*, 301 F.3d 54, 59 (2d Cir. 2002) (per curiam) (citation omitted). Plaintiff has failed to allege any facts demonstrating that extraordinary circumstances exist to warrant relief under Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(6). *See Ackermann v. United States*, 340 U.S. 193, 199-202 (1950).

LITIGATION HISTORY AND WARNING

Plaintiff has filed approximately fourteen cases in this Circuit, and he has been warned that filing further frivolous or otherwise nonmeritorious litigation in this Court would result in an order barring him, under 28 U.S.C. § 1651, from filing new actions *in forma pauperis* without prior permission. *See Caldwell v. City of New York*, ECF 1:18-CV-6064, 5 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 19, 2018) (listing cases and issuing warning). That warning remains in effect.

CONCLUSION

Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment and reconsideration is denied, and the Clerk of Court is directed to terminate it. (ECF No. 10.)

The Clerk of Court is further directed to mail a copy of this order to Plaintiff and note service on the docket.

Plaintiff's case is closed and the Court will only accept for filing documents that are directed to the Second Circuit Court of Appeals.

The Court certifies under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that any appeal from this order would not be taken in good faith, and therefore *in forma pauperis* status is denied for the purpose of an appeal. *See Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962).

SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 21, 2020
New York, New York



COLLEEN McMAHON
Chief United States District Judge